

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 14, and 16 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-7, 9-14, and 16-22 are pending.

Independent claims 1, 14, and 16 have been amended in a manner believed to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112. Support for the amendment is found, without limitation, in the specification at page 12, lines 14-19; page 13, lines 18-21.

The rejection of claims 1-7, 9-14, and 16-22 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kalajan in light of Teraoka is respectfully traversed. Each of claims 1, 14, and 16, has been amended to recite that “the authentication is based at least in part on a determination that the observed behavioral pattern of packets matches a pre-defined packet sequence.” Authentication that is based on the content of a packet (or smart card codes), as taught by Kalajan, or based on the content data contained in a header portion of a packet as taught by Teraoka, is not the same as authenticating based at least in part on a pattern of packets, as opposed to the content data included in such packets, matching a pre-defined packet sequence, as recited in claims 1, 14, and 16. Therefore, claims 1, 14, and 16, are believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-7 and 9-13, which depend from claim 1, and claims 17-22, which depend from claim 14, are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.


The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks.

If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/13/07

  
William J. James  
Registration No. 40,661  
V 408-973-2592  
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP  
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200  
Cupertino, CA 95014